

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 24, 26, 28, 63, 65, and 66 are pending in the present application; Claim 63 having been amended, Claim 64 having been cancelled, and Claim 66 having been added by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 63 and 64 were objected to, the specification was objected to, and Claims 24, 26-28, 63, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu et al. in view of Raith and Chen et al.

Claim 63 stands objected to because it is a duplication of Claim 28. In response to this objection, Claim 63 has been amended and now recites subject matter which is different from Claim 28.

Claim 64 was objected to because of the use of the term “Bluetooth” in the claim. In response to this objection, Claim 64 has been cancelled. While Claim 64 is being cancelled, there is no admission that the claims do not cover Bluetooth implementations of the claimed invention.

Claims 24, 26-28, 63, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu et al. in view of Raith and Chen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as recited in Claim 24, concerns a mobile communication terminal. Features of the invention include setting a hands-free mode of communication automatically if a connection procedure is completed, and disconnecting the hands-free mode and setting a communication mode of the mobile communication terminal in its own communication mode if no packet is received in a predetermined period of time. The combination recited in Claim 24 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.

When the mobile communication terminal is a mobile phone, according to the invention of Claim 24, a hands-free mode is automatically entered upon the occurrence of the claimed condition. Further, when no packet is received for a predetermined period of time, the connection with a car mounted electronic device is disconnected and the communication mode of the mobile phone returns to its own communication mode, meaning, for example, that the microphone and speaker of the mobile phone are used instead of the hands-free system.

Even if the prior art used to reject the claims could be combined, the resulting combination would not have all the features of the claimed invention. The outstanding Office Action relies on Chen et al. for the feature of disconnection with the car mounted electronic device and setting its own communication mode, and refers to column 9, line 51 – column 10, line 25 of Chen et al. However, Chen et al. merely discloses the disconnection in a different type of system, and does not disclose or suggest the setting of the communication mode to be in its own communication mode. Turning to column 9, line 51 – column 10, line 25, there is disclosed that the communication is stopped when packets are no longer correctly received. Specifically, column 10, lines 21-25 state,

“If a disconnect occurs during a communication, data packets are no longer correctly received and stored at the receiver to provide for the transmission for acknowledgement signals in ordinary course, and in turn results in the cessation of original data packet transmission.”

It is clear from the claim that the mobile communication terminal has a hands-free mode and its own communication mode. The disconnection which is disclosed in Chen et al. does not have these types of modes, and therefore, when there is the disconnection process, the features recited in the claim related to the changing of modes is not shown or suggested by Chen et al. and therefore, the claim is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of

references used in the outstanding Office Action. Moreover, one of the ordinary skill in the art would not combine Chen et al. with the other two patents used in the outstanding Office Action. Chen et al. does not relate to any mobile communication terminals and certainly no terminals which have both a hands-free mode of communication and their own mode of communication. Without such features, the invention cannot be obvious and one in the ordinary skill of the art would not turn to Chen et al. nor combine the features of Chen et al. with Chennakeshu et al. and Raith.


Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Added claim 66 is patentable for similar reasons as independent claim 24 is patentable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

James J. Kulbaski  
Registration No. 34,648